DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 092 SP 016 374

AUTHOR Drummond, Robert
TITLE The Impact of a Model of Student Teaching Supervision on Cooperating Teachers and Field Supervisors.
INSTITUTION New England Teacher Corps Network, Portsmouth, N.H.
PUB DATE Jul 80
NOTE 77p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperating Teachers: *Student Teacher Supervisors: *Student Teaching: *Supervisory Methods: *Supervisory Training: Teacher Workshops

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of training in supervision on the performance of cooperating teachers and field supervisors. A one day workshop based upon a model of supervision developed by Bcyan and Copeland (1978) was presented tc 32 cooperating teachers and field supervisors. The four stages of the model included a pre-observational conference between supervisor and teacher, cbservation by the supervisor of the teacher's class, analysis and identification of change by the supervisor, and a post-observational conference between the supervisor and teacher. The study addressed the major areas of: 1) the immediate reaction of participants to the model, components, and the need for further training in supervision: 2) the impact that the training had on their perfcrmance: 3) the needs, expectations, and personal dynamics of cooperating teachers: and 4) the practices of cooperating teachers. Conclusicns and recommendations for a model on theory of supervision, practice and program, and research and evaluaticn are presented. (Author/CJ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

New England Teacher Corps Network
Connecticut • Maine • Massachusetts • New Hampshire • Rhode Island • Vermont

ED189092

EXEMPLARY RESEARCH STUDY OF THE DEANS' COUNCIL

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sara Massey
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE IMPACT OF A MODEL OF STUDENT TEACHING SUPERVISION ON COOPERATING TEACHERS AND FIELD SUPERVISORS

Robert Brummond
University of Maine (Orono)

SP 016374

July, 1980

Post Office Box 1065 · Portsmouth, N.H. 03801 · 603-431-1422

NEW ENGLAND TEACHER COPRS NETWORK

DEANS' COUNCIL

1979-1980

Roger Bennett
Rhode Island College

Robert Cobb
University of Maine at Orono

Thomas J. Crowley
Keene State College

Mario Fantini
Univ. of Massachusetts at Amherst

Rodney Lane
Boston State College

Mark Shibles, Jr.
University of Connecticut

Arthur Smith
Northeastern University

Irving S. Starr
University of Hartford

Charles Tesconi
University of Vermont

Richard Wylie
Lesley College

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of training in supervision on the performances of cooperating teachers and field supervisors. An one day workshop based upon the model of supervision developed by Boyan and Copeland (1978) was presented to a group of 32 cooperating teachers and field supervisors who were supervising student teachers during the spring 1980 semester. The study addressed four major areas: one, the immediate reaction of the participants to the model, the components and the need for further training in supervision: two, the impact that the training had on their performance: three, the needs, expectations and personal dynamics of cooperating teachers; and four, the practices of cooperating teachers. Conclusions and recommendations for a model on theory of supervision, practice and program, and research and evaluation are presented.

JUL 2 9 1980

Table of Contents

Abstract

Section		Page
1	Introduction	1
	Statement of Problem	3
2	Procedure	5
	Design	5
	Sample	5
	Method	8
	Instruments	11
	Statistical Analysis	12
3	Results	13
	Immediate Reaction to Workshop	13
	Follow-up perceptions of participants	22
	Comparison of Workshop and Non-Workshop Teachers on Post Questionnaire	24
	Teaching Concerns and Behaviors of Workshop and Non-Workshop Teachers	28
4	Discussion	36
5	Conclusions and Recommendations	38
	Bibliography	41
	Appendicies	
	A Letter of Invitation	43
	B Letter of Confirmation of Registration	45
	C Request for Reimbursement Form	47
	D Request for Personal Reimbursement for Travel	49
	E Student Teacher Supervision Conference Agenda	51
	F Waiting List Letter	54
	G Demographic Data Form	56
	H Student Teacher Supervision Workshop Evaluation Form	58
	I Post Questionnaire	61
	J Teacher Concerns Checklist	65
	K Teacher Anxiety Scale	70

Table of Tables

Table		Page
1	Attitude of Participants Toward Supervision Workshop	14
2	Suggested Topics for Additional Workshops for Cooperating Teachers and Supervisors	17
3	What Participants Liked Best About the Workshop	18
4	What Participants Liked Least About the Workshop	19
5	Responses of Workshop and Non-Workshop Cooperating Teachers on Post Questionnaire	25
6	Comparison of Workshop and Non-Workshop Teachers on the Teaching Concerns Scale	29
7	Comparison of Workshop and Non-Workshop Teachers on the Teaching Anxiety Scale	33
8	Comparison of Workshop and Non-Workshop Teachers on the Tuckman Teacher Feedback Scale	35

The capstone of most teacher training programs is student teaching at a field site. The patterns of supervision vary from virtually no formal to a cooperative school-college model. No one model of student teaching supervision has proven to be more effective than any other (Bowman, 1979). Morris (1974) reported that there was little difference in the performance or adjustment of student teachers, supervised by university personnel as opposed to those under the exclusive direction of classroom teachers. Bowman (1979) concluded that with proper preparation and recognition, the cooperating teacher could do a vastly improved job and would have the freedom to work with another person untrammeled by the occasional input from a third party, who often makes incorrect judgments and offers inappropriate guidance on the basis of limited observations.

Much attention recently has been directed toward the development of training materials and programs for supervisors of student teachers. Lipke (1979) developed a pilot program for training cooperating teachers to better their communication skills. Cobert (1977) developed, implemented and evaluated an objective approach to supervising elementary school student teachers utilizing observational instruments. The University of Georgia, Engineering Center (1978) has developed a number of modules to give secondary and post secondary vocational teachers the skills to supervise student teachers. (Dyer, 1976) has provided criteria for humanistic competency training for supervisors and cooperating teachers. The Association of Teacher Education, among other professional groups has published guides to supervision (Heidelback, 1975). Lange (1975) has edited a text entitled a partnership for the supervision of student teachers in which

the historical development of clinical experiences is presented as well as the role of the supervisory teacher, the individual the author perceived as one who most influences the student teaching experience.

The cooperating teachers at Chicago State (1973) were trained to supervise student teachers. The training was designed to enhance skills in communication and interpersonal perceptions in addition to providing opportunities for the group to communicate about classroom procedures and objectives. Ottawa University (1973) also designed a program to strengthen communication and interpersonal relationships between the student teacher and supervising teacher.

St. Bonaventure University (Eberl, 1977) also developed an institute in supervision in order to help coordinating teachers gain the skills necessary for supervising and evaluating student teachers.

Key to the success of the formentioned models is the importance of knowledge of results which need to be communicated effectively. One of the major tenents of instructional psychology has been that knowledge of results by feedback can lead to improved performance (Gagne, 1977). The principle has been thought not only to have applicability to a student in the traditional classroom but to the student teachers and cooperating teachers. Feedback from student and supervisors is felt to be useful for the improvement of teaching (Centura, 1973). Rotem and Glasman (1979) postulate that teachers are likely to require different feedback according to their stage of professional development and their particular teaching situation.

One of the critical elements necessary if feedback is to be effective is the involvement of another person in the process. Peck and Tucker (1972) state that simply looking at one's own performance does not lead to much new insight into what one is doing or else it does not provide adequate motivation to alter

that program. They indicated after reviewing the available evidence that teachers use such feedback to make instructional changes in their teaching style only if another person participates in the feedback session.

The models previously cited have centered around limited dimensions of supervision. Sunal (1973) concluded that the variables influencing students during student teaching experiences are complex and require a search for adequate models of supervision and the types of situations that produce acceptance and enthusiasm in the student. Boyan (1974) advocated a model of the supervisory process which emphasizes the acquisition and use of specific supervisory skills such as the ability to observe and analyze systematically classroom instruction in order to identify behaviors needing change or maintenance. The model can be used to work with student teachers in order to help them develop solutions to their instructional problems.

There is a need for research to investigate the effects of supervision not only on the performances of the cooperating teachers but on their practices with student teachers. The purpose of this study was to investigate the impact that orientating cooperating teachers and field supervisors in a specific model of supervision has had on their attitudes, perceptions and behavior in their role as cooperating teachers. The instructional training program developed by Boyan and Copeland (1978) utilizing Teacher Corps sites was the basis of the workshop offered to cooperating teachers.

More specifically the following research questions were addressed:

(1) What was the immediate reaction of the participant to the workshop, the model, the components and the need for further training in supervision?

(2) What influence did the training have afterwards on the performance of the participant as a teacher or cooperating teacher?

(3) Were there different teaching concerns and dynamics of supervisory teachers compared to regular classroom teachers?

(4) Were there differences in role perceptions and practices of workshop participants as compared to supervisory teachers who did not participate in the training?

PROCEDURE

DESIGN

A post test only control group design was utilized to investigate the impact of the workshop on the project teachers. A pretest-post test design was selected to measure the immediate reaction of the participating teachers to the workshop and a post test only control group design used to compare the teaching concerns and anxiety of the workshop teachers and nonworkshop teachers.

SAMPLE

Cooperating teachers and field supervisors who were responsible for directing a student teacher during the spring semester 1980 were invited to participate in the workshop. Teachers who lived over 60 miles from the campus and specialists, such as art or music teachers were eliminated from the list. The pool consisted of elementary and secondary teachers in the content fields. There were89 teachers who were mailed invitations. The workshop was to be limited to 25 teachers. Thirty-two of the teachers or 36 percent attended. Twenty-seven or 84 percent were elementary teachers; two or 6.3 percent were secondary teachers. Four or 12.4 were principals, teaching principals, or curriculum coordinators who were field supervisors of student teachers within a school rather than the college supervisor.

The average years of teaching experience of the group was 12.7, the median 9.17, the mode 4.00. The range was from 4 to 44 years. Twenty-one or 66 percent had bachelors degrees; nine or 28.1 percent had masters degrees. Two failed to indicate their educational background.

Those in administration had been in administration on the average 17 years. The range was from 6 to 32 years, the mode 6.00, the median 9.00.

Nineteen or 59 percent of the group had supervised one student teacher this year. Seven or 21.7 percent had supervised more than one student teacher during the year.

The group had been supervising student teachers on the average 7.85 years. The range was from 1 to 44 years; the median 3.0 and the mode 1.00.

Four or 13 percent of the group were currently enrolled in a degree program at an university.

Six or 19 percent of the group had previous course work in supervision.

The sample of cooperating teachers and field supervisors not attending the workshop consisted of 42 of the remaining 57. This group was used to investigate the impact of the workshop on the attitude and behavior of the participants. Twenty-three (74%) were elementary teachers; nine (22%) were secondary teachers; nine (22%) were principals or supervisors in the schools.

The average years of teaching experience for the group was 12.5, the median 10.5 and the mode 9.0. The range was from 2 to 33 years. Twenty-two or 52.4 percent had bachelor degrees; 19 or 45.2 percent had masters degrees; and one or 2.4 percent had doctorates.

Thirty-four or 81 percent of the group had supervised one student teacher this year; eight or 19 percent had supervised more than one student teacher.

They averaged 6.98 years of having supervised student teachers. The range was from one to 31, the median 5.0 and the mode 1.0.

Six (15%) were currently enrolled in a degree program; three in masters, one in CAS and two in doctoral programs.

Fourteen or 34 percent have had a course in supervision.

A third comparison group was also utilized to compare their teaching behavior, concerns and anxiety with the workshop participants. This group was a group of teachers and administrators enrolled in graduate courses at the University of Maine at Orono on Monday evenings during the spring session.

The sample consisted of 15 teachers and 5 administrators. The average number of years of teaching for this group was 8.5. The range was from 1 to 24 years, the median was 6.5, the mode 3.0.

The average number of years in administration was 1.00, the range was one year, the median was 1.0, the mode 1.0. Four or 13.3 percent of the group had supervised student teachers before the average number of years they had supervised student teachers was one. Seventeen or 81 percent were currently working on masters.

Method

The list of cooperating teachers or field supervisors having student teachers during the Spring 1980 session was secured from the Director of Student Teaching. The group was mailed a letter inviting them to participate in the workshop. A postpaid card was included for the supervisors to indicate their willingness to participate (See Appendix A). Those accepted were mailed a Request for Reimbursement Form and A Request for Personal Expense Form as well as the workshop agenda (See Appendix B, C, D, E, and F).

In order to insure participation of teachers at the workshop, the project offered to provide up to $25 to the school district to pay for a substitute teacher for the participant attending the conference. The project also offered to pay up to $10 for travel expenses to the conference. Lunch was also provided the participants and the trainers and facilitators.

There were six trainers utilized in the workshop. Four of the trainers had gone through a week of extensive training in supervision at a workshop held by the Teacher Corps Network and were also experienced teachers. One of the trainers taught the course in Supervision at the University and used the model by Boyan and Copeland (1978). The other trainer also a staff member at the University taught courses in the teaching process and supervised student teachers. One of the above trainers was a Teacher Corps intern and went through the Teacher Corps instructional supervision workshop at San Diego. One was a member of the Teacher Corps staff from a neighboring state. The workshop trainers/presenters were paid a stipend for their participation in the workshop. They met several times for planning sessions prior to the workshop.

The workshop was based upon Boyan and Copeland (1978) model of supervision. The purpose of the session was to provide an overview to the model, not in-depth training in supervision. The training program as well as the sessions emphasized the important components of the process of instructional supervision and introduction

to the skills needed to use the model.

The model consists of four stages:

1) A pre-observational conference between supervisor and teacher.

2) Observation by Supervisor of teacher's class.

3) Analysis and identification of change by Supervisor.

4) Post observation conference between supervisor and teacher.

There are eight steps in the model:

1) to define behaviorally the area of concern

2) to decide to obtain a base rate or set a performance criterion

3) to select an observation instrument

4) to observe the specified behaviors

5) to analyze the observation results

6) to identify behaviors needing maintenance or change

7) to provide feedback of the data results

8) to determine strategies to maintain positive teaching behaviors, to change negative teaching behaviors, to select alternative strategies for accomplishing the desired changes, or deciding the appropriateness of recycling using the model again.

In the large group sessions, the participants were given an overview of the model and major components of the model, such as communication skills, identifying teaching/learning behaviors, systematic observational procedure, and feedback strategies. These sessions were presented through lecture by one of the trainer/facilitators. After each large group session, an activity or practical exercise from Boyan's and Copeland's text was used. All participants received a copy of the text to keep when they registered in the morning.

A videotape from the instructional package was used to present a teaching episode. The group was given guidance in developing an observational scale and

utilized it in analyzing the teaching siutation. Role palying of a feedback session was also demonstrated.

The cooperating teachers and field supervisors were also given opportunities to ask questions after each component. They were also given an opportunity to comment on the problems they had in supervising student teachers.

They were also asked to complete pre and post tests before and after the session. The tests and questionnaires are described in the instrument section of the paper.

Instruments

Six instruments were utilized in the study. Three were questionnaires developed for the study. The first questionnaire was a demographic data sheet (See Appendix G). The respondents were asked questions about their educational level, the years of teaching experience. The number of student teachers supervised, how many years they supervised student teachers and whether they had a course in supervision.

The second was a questionnaire constructed to assess their immediate reaction to the seminar. There were twelve Likert type of attitude items based upon the objectives and themes of the workshop and three open ended questions selected to assess the teachers perceptions of the strengths and weakness of the workshop (Appendix H).

The third was a post questionnaire to measure the delayed reaction to the seminar by the workshop participants as well as to compare their style of supervision with supervisory teachers who did not participate in the workshop. There were 20 items on five dimensions of supervision: general supervisory behavior, background and competencies of student teachers, personality dimensions of the cooperating teacher, analyzing dimensions of teaching, and communication skills. There were three open ended questions included just for teachers who did attend the workshop (See Appendix I).

The fourth instrument was the Teacher Concerns Checklist. The instrument was developed by George, Borich, and Fuller (1974) and George (1978) to assess the concerns of preservice and inservice teachers at different stages in their careers. The instrument has been used extensively in research studies and has been revised a number of times. Currently the instrument is being used in the Teacher Corps Program Evaluation being conducted by the Stanford Research Institute. There are sixty items to which teachers are asked to respond on a five point scale

from "not concerned at all" to "extremely concerned." There are three dimensions or subscales: self-concerns about teaching, situational or task concerns (focusing on the teaching situation), and student needs or impact concerns (focusing on the impact of teaching) (See Appendix J). There were four items added to the scale by the researcher relating to teacher education and supervision of student teachers.

The fifth instrument was the Teacher Anxiety Scale (Parsons, 1973). The instrument was a ten item scale in which the teachers were asked to respond on a five point scale from "never" to "always." The researcher added five items relating to anxiety in the student teaching situation (See Appendix K).

The sixt instrument was the Tuckman Teacher Feedback Form (Tuckman, 1971). The instrument is a twenty-eight item semantic differential type of scale used for each adjective pair a seven point scale. There are four factors measured creativity, dynamism (energy plus dominance), organized demeanor (organization plus control), and warmth and acceptance. These dimensions refer to the teacher's means of interpersonal classroom management, that is, how he or she deals with issues of control, ambiguity, and interaction. It was used in this study as a self-report instrument rather than completed by an observer. The test has been widely used in research and has established reliability and validity (Tuckman, 1979).

Statistical Analysis

A variety of statistical analyses were used in the study. The data were first key punched and programs from the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (Nie et. al., 1979) were used. The frequency program was used first for each analysis to provide the descriptive statistics for each item in the instrument.

Analysis of variance was utilized to compare the responses of the workshop and non-workshop teachers on data from scales that could be classified as interval.

For comparison of variables that were nominal, chi-square was selected to test whether the responses were independent.

RESULTS

The results are presented in four parts. First, the immediate reactions of the participants to the workshop on supervision is presented. Secondly, the delayed reaction to the workshop by the group is discussed. The third section contains the results of the post test only control group phase on attitudes and work styles of workshop and non-workshop cooperating teachers. In the fourth part the teaching concerns, anxiety and perceptions of self of the workshop teachers is compared to a control group of non cooperating teachers.

IMMEDIATE REACTION TO THE WORKSHOP

The participants immediate reaction to the workshop is reported in Table 1. There were eleven Likert type of attitude scale items used. Seven items were of the yes/no format with three having space for written comments.

There were three items on the specific topics presented in the workshop, communication skills, teaching/learning behaviors and observational skills. Seventy-nine percent of the participants agreed that they had a better understanding of observational skills. Eighteen percent disagreed. Fifty-seven percent indicated that they would like to have more sessions on teaching/learning behaviors while 29 percent disagreed. Fourty-six percent were in favor of additional sessions on communication skills while twenty-five percent disagreed about the need.

Evaluation of the materials, trainers, and procedures was also assessed. Seventy-five percent of the participants agreed that the objectives were met by the trainers. Eighteen percent disagreed. Only eleven percent of the group indicated that they felt too many topics were covered. Seventy-nine percent of the participants said the activities were appropriate for the topics presented.

TABLE 1

ATTITUDE OF PARTICIPANTS TOWARD SUPERVISION WORKSHOP

ITEM	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNSURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	M
Other workshops should be held	17 60.7	4 14.3	2 7.1	1 3.6	4 14.3	
Objectives were met by trainers	3 10.7	18 64.3	4 14.3	1 3.6	1 3.6	(1) (3.6)
Would like to have additional sessions on communication skills	6 21.4	7 25.0	8 28.6	4 14.3	3 10.7	
gained information which will help me work with student teachers	6 21.4	18 64.3	2 7.1	0 0.0	2 7.1	
Sessions did not meet my expectations	4 14.3	10 35.7	4 14.3	6 21.4	4 14.3	
Would like to have more sessions on teaching/learning behaviors	4 14.3	12 42.9	4 14.3	4 14.3	4 14.3	
would be willing to participate in future workshops	5 17.9	9 32.1	6 21.4	4 14.3	3 10.7	(1) (3.6)
Have better understanding of observational skills	8 28.6	14 50.0	0 0.0	2 07.1	3 10.7	(1) (3.6)
too many topics wers covered	0 0.0	3 10.7	4 14.3	15 53.6	5 17.9	1 3.6
Activities were appropriate for the topics presented	2 7.1	20 71.4	1 3.6	3 10.7	2 7.1	
Texts and handouts Helpful	5 17.9	20 71.4	0 0.0	1 3.6	2 7.1	

About eighty-nine percent indicated that the texts and materials distributed in the session were helpful.

They were asked in two items their attitudes toward holding additional workshops. Seventy-five percent (61 percent strongly agree and 14 percent agree) were in favor of other workshops being held. Five of the 28 respondents or 19 percent were not in favor. They were not as positive, however, as to their willingness to participate in future workshops. Half of the group were; twenty-one percent were unsure and twenty-five percent were unwilling to participate. Two items related to the rating of the workshop for transferability for working with student teachers and for the personal value perceived by attending the sessions. Eighty-six percent of the participants agreed that the information gained in the sessions would help them in their work with student teachers. There was a smaller percentage of teachers who felt that the sessions met their personal expectations. Fifty percent of the group indicated that the session did not meet their expectations while 36 percent disagreed. Fourteen percent were unsure.

More specific questions were asked of the participants as to their interest and willingness to participate in future workshops. The Boyan and Copeland model of supervision was presented to the group. Fifteen or 54 percent of the personnel said they wanted further training on the model. Twelve or 43 percent stated no. One participant failed to respond to the item. Sixty-one percent of the group indicated their willingness to attend other sessions. Ten or 36 percent checked no. They were asked when they would be willing to attend sessions. Three choices were given: after school, evenings, or Saturday. Seven percent indicated their preference for after school; five (18 percent), for evenings; and three (11 percent), for Saturday. Of the seventeen that indicated that they would be willing to attend other sessions, thirteen (46 percent) indicated that

would prefer to have recertification credit for the sessions.

About two-thirds of the group (18 or 64 percent) indicated their willingness to attend workshops on other topics. The list of themes suggested is included in Table 2. Three major themes were identified. The most frequently appearing topic was skills needed by student teacher. The second was sessions on program problems and the third related to communication problems between the cooperating teacher, student teacher, supervisor, and University. It should be noted that a third of the participants checked "yes" but did not give any suggestions for specific topics.

The participants were also asked what they liked best about the workshop. The themes are presented in Table 3. The most dominant theme was comments on the trainers/presenters. One presenter was viewed as more enthusiastic, dynamic and energetic than the others. Three of the presenters though received positive comments. The second major themewas the methods and materials used. The most frequent comment in this category was the group enjoyed the analyses and feedback sessions most and liked the chance for interaction and activity. The third theme related to the topics presented. The majority of comments were on the value of communication skills, observational skills and overview of the general model presented.

One unplanned positive feature viewed by several of the participants was the chance to talk with other teachers in the free time about how they do student teacher supervision.

The participants were also asked to list what they liked least about the workshop. The themes and sample responses are listed in Table 4. There were six themes identified: The Topics and Content, The Trainers or Presenters, The Method and Materials, the Physical Environment, Personal Reaction, and Overall Reactions to Student Teaching Program. The <u>two</u> major dimensions

TABLE 2

Suggested topics for additional Workshops for

Cooperating Teachers and Supervisors

Theme/Topic	Examples
Skills Needed by Student Teachers	Skills that should be prerequisite for student teachers. Forming a minimum competency list on some method of measuring what skills a student teacher has before entering my class. Universities expectations of what student teacher should get out of student teaching.
Program Problems	Particular problems in having student teachers. Bringing along a very slow student teacher-shy, unsure. Assigning classroom duties to student teacher. How to assign a program on involvement of student teachers.
Communication Problems	What the students know who come to us. The grades and ranking of student teachers. What do I as a teacher expect from a student teacher (first time). Expectation of student teachers.

TABLE 3

WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKED BEST ABOUT THE WORKSHOP

THEME	EXAMPLE
Trainers/Presenters	The speaker on communication skills were vivacious, interesting, presentation of the model was quite good. Variety of people conducting workshop. Each presenter was well prepared and organized. Their presentations were brief and to the point. Generous cooperation of those giving the workshop to those individuals who needed some extra help in understanding.
Methods/Materials	Video tape and observational instrument. The feedback session. Handout materials. Chance for interaction and activitiy. Analysis and feedback. Role playing by participants.
Topics	The stress on interpersonal communications. Observational instruments. The overview of the model.
Informal Interaction of Participants	Talking with other teachers in free time about how they do student teacher supervision. Interaction and discussion among area teachers.

TABLE 4

What Participants Liked Least About the Workshop

TOPIC	EXAMPLE
Topics and Content	Too much repetition. Perhaps two sessions could have helped us better, too much content. Not enough time to cover topics presented.
Trainers/Presenters	One presenter was awful. I am not sure if I ever got his point. XXX hollers and does not practice what he preaches. Reading from the textbook away from the lecture she gave. If you do this again - at least have speakers who do not insult the intelligence of the audience. The speakers were dull, uninteresting and repititious. In a classroom situation each speaker except one would have lost their students after two minutes.
Procedures	Schedule. Parts cut off too short. More practice using observational schedules would be helpful. Length of Session. Too much covered in too short of a time frame. More group sessions and practice sessions. I did not appreciate the technique of putting people on the spot of answering questions as interest waned. Too long a session to sit through. Don't need someone to read off a paper to me when I could read it myself. Need more time for participant "weir stories" and group analysis.
Physical Environment	Room too small. Improper ventilation. Excessive noise in facility utilized for workshop. No change of scenery. It is too bad it was held in one room (lunch included). However, we are not used to sitting all day and maybe are more uncomfortable than the rest.
Personal Expectations	I wanted to get prepared for having a student teacher and what to expect and I'm leaving not having any answers. We need workshops on methods for evaluating student teachers. Also, in a workshop what we need to discuss is what to expect of the student teacher.

TABLE 4
(Continued)

What Participants Liked Least About the Workshop

TOPIC	EXAMPLE
	Did not deal with non-observable problems- e.g. the student teacher who is not sufficiently prepared academically for teaching.
	Nothing was in reference to secondary schools.
Overall Reaction to Student Teaching Program Not the Workshop	Eight weeks too short.
	Requirements seem less and less stringent.
	The entire philosophy is based upon the premise that the student teacher will be aware of his/her own areas of weakness or will be made aware of this through questions. This is not always the case. Some do not have the experience or the resourcefulness to make that determination without stronger guidance - both judgemental and evaluative.
	Student teachers who come through the child development program are invariably better prepared for student teaching than those from education.
	I didn't feel personnel were too receptive to our comments concerning training and entry skills of student teachers. Personally, I was very concerned when I learned that my student teacher this winter had not had practice writing lesson plans or behavioral objectives, didn't know what an attendance register was, had nosocometric skills, had no knowledge about achievement tests and individual tests or learning theory. I wonder how fair it is to expect the supervising teacher to cram in these "gaps" in seven or eight weeks along with everything <u>else</u> there is to contend with!
	For teaching educational methods courses I feel our greatest resources are the teachers out there with 20 years of experience of really practicing what they preach. They would have an awful lot to offer concerning good methods, content, <u>knowledge</u> of kids, etc.
	A longer internship with varied experiences would improve teacher quality. Would you go to a doctor who had only eight weeks <u>internship</u>?
	I feel that students need more classroom experience.

TABLE 4
(Continued)

What Participants Liked Least About the Workshop

TOPIC	EXAMPLE
	Eight weeks is not enough! Ask the cooperating teachers! May be the education department should invite several or many cooperating teachers to a discussion of student teacher preparation. Somewhere in their methods classes they should: 1. know proper dress 2. classroom teacher behavior 3. know how to write a lesson plan 4. general classroom management ideas

receiving the most comments by the most participants were presenters and the methods and procedures. Many comments were also directed to the student teaching program.

FOLLOW-UP PERCEPTIONS OF PARTICIPANTS

The participants were asked three questions about the workshop on the supervision of student teaching. Fourteen of the 28 or 50% of the group responded to the post questionnaire. The first question asked whether they had read the text by Boyan and Copeland. Only two of the fourteen or fourteen percent said that they had. The second related to whether they had used any of the concepts from the workshop or text in their work. Seven of the fourteen or fifty percent of those responding to the questionnaire circled "yes." If yes, they were asked what concepts they found helpful. They indicated the following:

1. More focusing on one or two points to be observed over a period of time.
2. I will use more of the information in the future, but mostly felt it was reassuring to me to feel I did many things suggested in the workshop rather instinctively, including allowing the student-teacher to have a "bad day" (but only rarely!) or making some mistakes we could work through.
3. Pinpointing the cause of problems in a classroom seemed like hunting for the so called needle. The workshop helped me to understand the questionning process that I can use on myself and other teachers.
4. The communication skills.
5. Wording questions so the student-teacher is guided to answer them herself.
6. Using a conference with the student-teacher to identify and rectify problem areas.
7. Those which have practical application and are similar to the techniques such as Flanders' survey and other techniques which have been used for years to help a student identify his or her own areas of strength and weakness.

8. I've been able to fine tune my own teaching strategies using the methods I acquired in the workshop.

The third question was whether the workshop provided any ideas or concepts which will help them improve as a supervisor or teacher. Again, seven of the fourteen responding or fifty percent checked "yes." The following are a list of the ideas or concepts written by the teachers:

1. The "plan of attack" for dealing with the students problem especially designing the tool for use in an observation.
2. To really try and let the student teacher see her short comings first.
3. The basic idea was helpful; but much of it was common sense. Every student teacher does not always see weak areas. For the sake of the children, it is not always possible to wait for them to be aware of it. The kids have to come first.
4. It made me appreciate the quality of my undergraduate and graduate training.
5. The communication techniques.
6. Wording questions so the student teacher is guided to answer them herself.
7. Being able to guide the student teacher to identify his/her own weak areas.
8. Not really anything new but maybe provided stimuli for rethinking techniques used in the past and shelved for awhile.
9. I was really impressed with the ease in making an observational instrument. It is also good just to spend time with others to disucuss the supervisionary situation. It was one of the best workshops I have attended.
10. I've been able to fine tune my own teaching strategies using the methods I acquired at the workshop.

COMPARISON OF WORKSHOP AND NON-WORKSHOP TEACHERS ON POST QUESTIONNAIRE

The workshop and non-workshop cooperating teachers were mailed a twenty item questionnaire a month after the workshop was held. The responses to the survey are presented in Table 5. There were three significant differences between the means of the two groups. The workshop group felt that they would like to know more about how to supervise student teachers than the non-workshop group. The mean for the workshop group was 3.93 as compared to 3.17 for the non-workshop group. The difference was significant at the .01 level.

The workshop group reported that they tended to zero in on just one specific dimension of teaching when they observe a student teacher more than the non-workshop group. The mean for the workshop group was 3.00 and the mean for the non-workshop group was 2.17. The difference was significant at the .01 level.

The workshop teachers were less positive about the knowledge that student teachers had of the content that they taught than non-workshop teachers. The mean for workshop teachers was 3.29 as compared to 3.67 for non-workshop teachers.

There was only one item which had a significant chi-square but not an F. (9.89, d. f. 3, sig. .019) The item related to whether the cooperative teacher learned new things and techniques from their student teacher. Fifty-seven percent of the workshop group checked always to twenty-four percent of the non-workshop group.

On the general supervision behavior factor of the questionnaire (items 3, 10, 11, 16 and 18) there were no significant differences between the two groups. Both groups had mean ratings of four (frequently) on being able to define dimensions of the teaching process in observable terms, or being able to guide student teachers to identify their weak areas, on being able to provide an excellent model for their student teachers, on being able to provide adequate feedback to them and helping them formulate alternative strategies in their problem areas.

TABLE 5

RESPONSES OF WORKSHOP AND NON-WORKSHOP COOPERATING TEACHERS ON POST QUESTIONNAIRE

ITEM	GROUP/CATEGORY	Never	Infrequently	Occasionally	Frequently	Always	M	SD	F
I feel calm and collected when I hold conferences with student teachers	NW	0	0	0	22	20	4.48	0.51	0.09
		0.0	0.0	0.0	52.4	47.6			
	W	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	0.51	
		0.0	0.0	0.0	57.1	42.9			
I feel that I would like to know more about how to supervise student teachers	NW	1	6	25	5	5	3.17	0.91	7.69xx
		2.4	14.3	59.5	11.9	11.9			
	W	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	0.83	
		0.0	0.0	35.7	35.7	28.6			
I am able to define dimensions of the teaching process in "observable" terms	NW	1	1	3	30	5	3.93	0.73	0.49
		2.5	2.5	7.5	75.0	12.5			
	W	0	0	1	11	2	4.07	0.48	
		0.0	0.0	7.1	78.6	14.3			
I zero in on just one specific dimension of teaching when I observe a student teacher	NW	13	13	10	5	0	2.17	1.02	7.96xx
		31.7	31.7	24.4	12.2	0.0			
	W	0	3	8	3	0	3.00	0.68	
		0.0	21.4	57.1	21.4	0.0			
I am able to design observational instruments to help identify specific components of the teaching process for my student teacher	NW	3	5	11	19	2	3.30	1.02	0.17
		7.5	12.5	27.5	47.5	5.0			
	W	0	2	6	4	2	3.43	0.94	
		0.0	14.3	42.9	28.6	14.3			
A supervisor should only observe dimensions of teaching that the Student teacher identifies as problem areas	NW	26	10	3	3	0	1.60	0.91	2.21
		61.9	23.8	7.1	7.1	0.0			
	W	4	6	4	0	0	2.00	0.78	
		28.6	42.9	28.6	0.0	0.0			
Student teachers are able to identify their weak areas	NW	4	15	23	0	0	3.45	0.67	0.34
		9.5	37.7	54.8	0.0	0.0			
	W	1	4	9	0	0	3.57	0.65	
		7.1	28.6	64.3	0.0	0.0			
Student teachers have a good background in the methodology of teaching	NW	0	7	15	20	0	3.31	0.75	0.18
		0.0	16.7	35.7	47.6	0.0			
	W	0	2	7	5	0	3.21	0.70	
		0.0	14.3	50.0	35.7	0.0			
Student teachers have a good background in the content they teach	NW	0	1	13	27	1	3.67	0.57	
		0.0	2.4	31.0	64.3	2.4			4.08x
	W	0	2	6	6	0	3.29	0.73	
		0.0	14.3	42.9	42.9	0.0			
I am able to guide student teachers to identify their weak areas	NW	0	1	1	36	4	4.02	0.47	
		0.0	2.4	2.4	85.7	9.5			1.47
	W	0	0	2	12	0	3.86	0.36	
		0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	0.0			

TABLE 5

RESPONSES OF WORKSHOP AND NON-WORKSHOP COOPERATING TEACHERS ON POST QUESTIONNAIRE

ITEM	GROUP/CATEGORY	Never	Infrequently	Occasionally	Frequently	Always	M	SD	F
I feel calm and collected when I hold conferences with student teachers	NW	0	0	0	22	20	4.48	0.51	0.09
		0.0	0.0	0.0	52.4	47.6			
	W	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	0.51	
		0.0	0.0	0.0	57.1	42.9			
I feel that I would like to know more about how to supervise student teachers	NW	1	6	25	5	5	3.17	0.91	7.69xx
		2.4	14.3	59.5	11.9	11.9			
	W	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	0.83	
		0.0	0.0	35.7	35.7	28.6			
I am able to define dimensions of the teaching process in "observable" terms	NW	1	1	3	30	5	3.93	0.73	0.49
		2.5	2.5	7.5	75.0	12.5			
	W	0	0	1	11	2	4.07	0.48	
		0.0	0.0	7.1	78.6	14.3			
I zero in on just one specific dimension of teaching when I observe a student teacher	NW	13	13	10	5	0	2.17	1.02	7.96xx
		31.7	31.7	24.4	12.2	0.0			
	W	0	3	8	3	0	3.00	0.68	
		0.0	21.4	57.1	21.4	0.0			
I am able to design observational instruments to help identify specific components of the teaching process for my student teacher	NW	3	5	11	19	2	3.30	1.02	0.17
		7.5	12.5	27.5	47.5	5.0			
	W	0	2	6	4	2	3.43	0.94	
		0.0	14.3	42.9	28.6	14.3			
A supervisor should only observe dimensions of teaching that the Student teacher identifies as problem areas	NW	26	10	3	3	0	1.60	0.91	2.21
		61.9	23.8	7.1	7.1	0.0			
	W	4	6	4	0	0	2.00	0.78	
		28.6	42.9	28.6	0.0	0.0			
Student teachers are able to identify their weak areas	NW	4	15	23	0	0	3.45	0.67	0.34
		9.5	37.7	54.8	0.0	0.0			
	W	1	4	9	0	0	3.57	0.65	
		7.1	28.6	64.3	0.0	0.0			
Student teachers have a good background in the methodology of teaching	NW	0	7	15	20	0	3.31	0.75	0.18
		0.0	16.7	35.7	47.6	0.0			
	W	0	2	7	5	0	3.21	0.70	
		0.0	14.3	50.0	35.7	0.0			
Student teachers have a good background in the content they teach	NW	0	1	13	27	1	3.67	0.57	
		0.0	2.4	31.0	64.3	2.4			4.08x
	W	0	2	6	6	0	3.29	0.73	
		0.0	14.3	42.9	42.9	0.0			
I am able to guide student teachers to identify their weak areas	NW	0	1	1	36	4	4.02	0.47	
		0.0	2.4	2.4	85.7	9.5			1.47
	W	0	0	2	12	0	3.86	0.36	
		0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	0.0			

TABLE 5
(Continued)

RESPONSES OF WORKSHOP AND NON-WORKSHOP COOPERATING TEACHERS ON POST QUESTIONNAIRE

ITEM	GROUP/CATEGORY	Never	Infrequently	Occasionally	Frequently	Always	M	SD	F
I feel that I can provide an excellent model for my student teacher	NW	0	2	3	27	10	4.07	0.71	0.49
		0.0	4.8	7.1	64.3	23.8			
	W	0	0	2	11	1	3.93	0.47	
		0.0	0.0	14.3	78.6	7.1			
I feel nervous about having college supervisors observe in my classroom	NW	20	13	6	1	1	1.78	0.96	0.59
		48.8	31.7	14.6	2.4	2.4			
	W	4	6	4	0	0	2.00	0.78	
		28.6	42.9	28.6	0.0	0.0			
I learn new things and techniques from my student teacher	NW	0	2	14	16	10	3.81	0.86	2.84
		0.0	4.8	33.3	38.1	23.8			
	W	0	2	0	4	8	4.29	1.07	
		0.0	14.3	0.0	28.6	57.1			
My student teachers are able to communicate their goals and objectives clearly to me	NW	0	0	16	22	4	3.71	0.64	0.48
		0.0	0.0	38.1	52.4	9.5			
	W	0	1	5	7	1	3.57	0.76	
		0.0	7.1	35.7	50.0	7.1			
I use behavioral statements to describe the performance of the student teacher to him/her	NW	2	6	18	12	2	3.15	0.92	0.06
		5.0	15.0	45.0	30.0	5.0			
	W	0	1	9	4	0	3.21	0.58	
		0.0	7.1	64.3	28.6	0.0			
I provide adequate feedback	NW	0	0	2	30	9	4.17	0.50	0.04
		0.0	0.0	4.9	73.2	22.0			
	W	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	0.36	
		0.0	0.0	0.0	85.7	14.3			
At the end of student teaching my student teacher can analyze and solve his/her own problems-	NW	0	0	8	31	3	3.88	0.50	1.19
		0.0	0.0	19.0	73.8	7.1			
	W	0	0	4	10	0	3.71	0.47	
		0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4	0.0			
I am able to help student teachers formulate alternative strategies in their problem areas	NW	0	1	10	27	4	3.81	0.63	0.02
		0.0	2.4	23.8	64.3	9.5			
	W	0	0	4	9	1	3.79	0.58	
		0.0	0.0	28.6	64.3	7.1			
I am less happy supervising student teachers than I thought I'd be	NW	8	24	7	1	2	2.17	0.93	0.36
		19.0	57.1	16.7	2.4	4.8			
	W	4	5	2	2	1	2.36	1.28	
		28.6	35.7	14.3	14.3	7.1			
I get agreement from the student of what should be observed before observing the class	NW	3	13	14	9	1	2.80	0.97	1.90
		7.5	32.5	35.0	22.5	2.5			
	W	0	4	4	5	1			
		0.0	28.6	28.6	35.7	7.1			

x p .05 ** p .01

The second factor related to the perceptions by the cooperating teachers of the background and competencies of their student teachers (items 7, 8, 9, 14, 17). There was one difference previously discussed on how teachers perceived the student teachers background in the content they taught. Workshop teachers had a less positive perception than non-workshop teachers. The mean ratings of both groups on the remaining four items ranged in the three or "occasional" category. The items related to the student teachers' ability to identify their weak areas, having a good background in methodology, their ability to communicate their goals, and their ability to analyze and solve their own problems.

There were three items relating to personality dimensions of the cooperating teacher, anxiety about being observed by a college supervisor, and about satisfaction or happiness with the experience of having a student teacher and about holding conferences with the student. The mean ratings by the teachers to the anxiety and happiness, were in the two or "infrequent" range. The mean ratings on being calm and collected during a conference with a student teacher were in the 4 or "frequent" range. There were no significant differences between the groups.

There were two items relating to analyzing dimensions of teaching, designing observational instruments and using behavioral statements to describe the performance of student teachers. There were no differences between the two groups of teachers in the mean ratings. The ratings fell in the three or "occasional" category.

TEACHING CONCERNS AND BEHAVIORS OF WORKSHOP AND NON-WORKSHOP TEACHERS

The teaching concerns of workshop and non-workshop teachers is presented in Table 6. There were significant differences between the groups on only six of the items, three from the original scale and three of the four items added by the researcher on dimensions of supervision. First the former items are discussed. There was significant difference on the .01 level on the item being asked personal questions by my students. Although not a strong concern by either group the teachers not supervising student teachers had a significant higher mean (2.05) than those supervising student teachers and participating in the workshop (1.48). Two items were significant at the .05 level. The workshop teachers were less concerned about doing well when a supervisor is present than non-workshop teachers (2.84 W, 3.55 NW). The same pattern held true for getting a favorable evaluation of their teaching (3.08 W, 3.75 NW).

There were significant differences past the .01 level on three of the four items on supervision. The workshop teachers were much more concerned than the non-workshop teachers in the training of future teachers (4.13 W; 3.20 NW). They also rated knowing effective ways of communicating to student teachers as a greater concern (W 4.13, NW 2.95) as well as knowing how to analyze their teaching, and (or their student teachers' teaching through use of observational scales (W 3.95; NW 3.15).

In looking at the rank order of the teaching concerns of the workshop teachers, the following are the highest:

1. Meeting the needs of different kinds of students. (4.36)
2. Insuring that students grasp subject matter fundamentals. (4.28)
3. Instilling worthwhile concepts and values. (4.25)
4. Diagnosing student learning problems. (4.24)
5. Challenging unmotivated students. (4.16)

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF WORKSHOP AND NON-WORKSHOP TEACHERS

ON THE TEACHING CONCERNS SCALE

CONCERN	GROUP					
	WORKSHOP		NON-WORKSHOP			
	M	SD	M	SD	f	
Lack of respect of some students	3.46	1.06	3.90	1.02	1.98	NS
Standards & regulations for teachers	3.19	1.36	3.20	1.11	0.00	NS
Selecting & teaching content well	3.92	1.05	3.79	0.97	0.18	NS
Mandated curriculum is not appropriate	3.38	1.02	3.65	1.23	0.64	NS
Whether students learn what they should	4.00	0.98	3.95	0.99	0.02	NS
Whether students really like me	2.70	0.95	2.30	0.73	2.49	NS
Increasing pupil feeling of accomplishment	4.12	0.71	4.10	0.91	0.00	NS
Quality of instructional material	3.89	1.12	3.90	0.64	0.00	NS
Where I stand as a teacher	3.22	1.22	3.58	0.84	1.22	NS
Motivating students to study	3.52	1.16	3.80	1.11	0.71	NS
Working with other teachers	3.36	1.22	3.70	0.98	1.02	NS
Lack of instructional materials	2.85	1.35	2.60	0.82	0.52	NS
Rapid curriculum change	2.68	1.41	2.60	0.75	0.05	NS
Feeling Under Pressure	2.64	0.76	2.60	1.31	0.02	NS
Routine and inflexibility	2.52	0.96	2.70	1.26	0.30	NS
Becoming too personally involved	1.44	0.65	1.75	0.79	2.09	NS
Maintaining the appropriate control	2.32	1.24	2.60	1.19	0.58	NS
Acceptance as friend of students	1.92	0.91	2.05	0.89	0.23	NS
Understanding principals policies	2.48	1.23	2.85	1.14	1.08	NS
Wide range of student achievement	3.32	0.95	3.35	1.27	0.01	NS

TABLE 6

CONCERN	GROUP					
	WORKSHOP		NON-WORKSHOP			
	M	SD	M	SD	f	
Doing well supervisor present	2.84	1.11	3.55	1.15	4.44*	
Meeting needs of different students	4.36	0.76	4.35	0.81	0.00	NS
Being fair and impartial	4.04	0.98	4.20	1.11	0.26	NS
Diagnosing student learning problems	4.24	0.66	4.25	0.72	0.00	NS
Getting favorable evaluation of teaching	3.08	0.99	3.75	1.07	4.70*	
Asked personal questions by students	1.48	0.87	2.05	0.60	6.16**	
Too many non-instructional duties	2.80	1.26	2.55	1.15	0.47	NS
Insuring students grasp fundamentals	4.28	0.94	4.20	0.83	0.09	NS
Working with too many students	2.80	1.19	2.60	1.09	0.34	NS
Challenging unmotivated students	4.16	0.85	4.45	0.60	1.65	NS
Values and attitudes of present generation	3.[illegible]	0.88	3.70	0.86	0.47	NS
Adapting to needs of different students	3.76	1.05	4.00	0.73	0.73	NS
Whether students can apply learning	3.92	1.07	3.95	0.69	0.01	NS
Understanding philosophy of schools	2.52	1.00	2.75	0.91	0.63	NS
Students who disrupt classes	3.72	0.89	3.85	0.93	0.23	NS
Instilling worthwhile concepts & values	4.25	0.85	4.15	0.75	0.17	NS
How students feel about me	2.88	1.01	2.60	0.88	0.95	NS
Nutrition problems that affect learning	3.76	1.01	3.50	1.00	0.74	NS
Psychological climate of school	3.68	0.98	3.90	0.91	0.59	NS
Clarifying limits of my authority	3.00	1.04	2.95	1.19	0.02	NS
Assessing & reporting student progress	3.60	0.82	3.45	0.89	0.35	NS
Chronic absences/dropouts	3.12	1.20	3.55	1.19	1.43	NS

TABLE 6

CONCERN	GROUP					
	WORKSHOP		NON-WORKSHOP			
	M	SD	M	SD	f	
Lack of academic freedom	2.25	0.79	2.65	1.18	1.79	NS
Teaching content to varied students	3.00	0.93	2.65	0.99	1.46	NS
Student use of drugs	3.83	1.30	4.15	0.81	0.92	NS
Feeling more adequate as teacher	2.87	1.01	3.05	0.94	0.36	NS
Guiding intellectual & emotional growth	4.00	1.00	4.10	0.72	0.14	NS
Being accepted professionally	3.04	0.93	3.30	0.73	0.99	NS
Adequately presenting required material	3.39	0.89	3.75	1.01	1.52	NS
Slow progress of some students	3.91	0.73	3.65	0.59	1.65	NS
Ability to present ideas to class	3.43	0.95	3.15	1.35	0.66	NS
Helping students value education	4.00	1.00	4.15	0.75	0.30	NS
Whether student gets what he needs	4.00	0.52	4.30	0.66	2.78	NS
Increasing proficiency in content	3.48	0.90	3.35	0.81	0.24	NS
Social and emotional needs of students	3.91	0.85	3.95	0.89	0.02	NS
Ethnic & socio-economic background	2.52	0.95	2.90	0.85	1.87	NS
Training future teachers	4.13	0.87	3.20	0.95	11.23***	
Effective ways of communicating with students	4.13	0.86	2.95	1.13	14.73***	
Identifying problem areas in teaching	4.00	0.90	3.85	0.88	0.30	NS
Using observational scale	3.95	1.05	3.15	0.93	6.87**	

NS nonsignificant

* p .05

** p .01

*** p .001

6.5 Training of future teachers. (4.13)

6.5 Knowing effective ways of communicating to student teachers. (4.13)

8. Increasing pupils feelings of accomplishment. (4.12)

10.5 Whether students are learning what they should. (4.00)

10.5 Guiding students toward intellectual and emotional growth. (4.00)

10.5 Whether students are learning what they need. (4.00)

10.5 Helping students to value education. (4.00)

The following items were of least concern to cooperating teachers:

1. Becoming too personally involved with students. (1.44)
2. Being asked personal questions by my students. (1.48)
3. Acceptance as a friend by students. (1.92)
4. Lack of academic freedom. (2.25)
5. Maintaining the appropriate degree of class control. (2.32)
6. Understanding the principal's policies. (2.48)
7. Understanding the philosophy of the school. (2.52)
8. The routine and inflexibility of the situation. (2.52)
9. The wide diversity a student ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds. (2.52)
10. Feeling under pressure too much of the time. (2.74)

The items listed as high concerns are items dealing with student needs or impact concerns (focusing on the impact of teaching). Those having the least priority are items relating to self-concerns about teaching and situational or task concerns (focusing on the teaching situation).

The teaching anxiety of workshop and non-workshop teachers was also compared. The comparison of responses to the items is given on Table 7. There were significant differences on eight of the eleven items. Workshop teachers reported themselves to be more calmer in parent teacher conferences and when parents observed them than non-workshop teachers. Non-workshop teachers were

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF WORKSHOP AND NON-WORKSHOP TEACHERS

ON THE TEACHING ANXIETY SCALE

ITEMS	GROUP					
	WORKSHOP		NON-WORKSHOP			
	M	SD	M	SD	f	
Calm in parent-teacher conferences	4.42	.72	3.95	.71	5.14*	
Worried about being a good teacher	4.25	.56	2.79	.92	49.53***	
Calm when parents observe me	2.68	.97	3.47	.84	8.63**	
Secure in my ability to control class	2.06	1.21	4.42	.61	61.88***	
Less happy in teaching than expected	4.45	.51	2.47	1.31	57.58***	
Confident of ability to improvise	2.63	1.04	4.26	0.56	40.01***	
Other teachers think I am competent	3.97	.66	3.79	0.86	0.69	NS
Worried about keeping students interested	3.88	1.07	2.79	0.71	15.41***	
Feel uncertain about how to present	2.22	1.03	2.22	0.64	0.00	NS
Have good recall in front of class	2.55	1.06	4.21	0.41	42.41***	
Worried about being a good cooperating teacher	2.67	1.53	2.56	1.20	0.02	NS

NS non-significant
* p .05
** p .01
*** p .001

1=Never
5=Always

less worried about being a good teacher, more secure in their ability to control class, more happy in teaching, more confident of their ability to improve, less worried about keeping students interested, and having better recall in front of class than workshop teachers. The mean for workshop teachers was 28.38 and for non-workshop teachers 49.80. A low score indicates higher anxiety; high score, less anxiety, A F of 65.99 was computed and significant at the .001 level. Cooperating teachers participating in the workshop were more anxious about dimensions of their performance than non-workshop teachers.

There were no significant differences on the four dimensions of the Tuckman Teacher Feedback Scale. The results are included on Table 8. There were no significant differences between the means on any of the four scales: Creativity, Organized Demeanor, Dynamism, or Warmth and Acceptance. The mean ratings for the non-workshop teachers were higher although not statistically significant than non-workshop teachers on each scale.

TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF WORKSHOP AND NON-WORKSHOP TEACHERS

ON THE TUCKMAN TEACHER FEEDBACK SCALE

SCALE	GROUP				
	WORKSHOP (32)		NON-WORKSHOP (20)		
	M	SD	M	SD	f
Creativity	13.44	5.27	15.65	4.16	2.53
Organized demeanor	8.56	4.28	10.25	5.84	1.44
Dynamism	18.31	8.13	20.50	6.25	1.06
Warmth and acceptance	8.69	3.77	10.50	4.72	2.34

DISCUSSION

The immediate reaction of the participants to the workshop was positive. They felt that the workshop had helped them with their work with student teachers. The majority were in favor of the College of Education holding additional workshops for cooperating teachers. The group was slightly less enthusiastic about attending future workshops on the model. About half of the group were interested in further training in the model or components of the model such as communication skills and identifying teaching/learning behaviors.

Although the group endorsed the idea for future workshops, only about half expressed an interest in attending them. Partly one of the problems might have been the needs or expectations of the participants. About half of the group felt that the session did not meet their expectations. They were not as interested in a model as to discuss the immediate problems they faced. There was a lack of understanding by some of the teachers of the performance objectives for student teaching and of the system that should be used to evaluate the student teachers. They were also concerned about the short length (8 weeks) of student teaching. Teachers perceived the need of being more involved in the program, setting objectives and requirements for the student teachers.

Secondly, the impact of the training on the performance of the participants after the workshop was studied. For most of the teachers the workshop confirmed or reinforced practices that they were already using. Since only four of the 32 participants had student teachers during the last eight weeks of the semester, only a few had a chance to try parts of the model out with their student teachers.

Thirdly, the needs, expectations and personal dynamics of the cooperating teachers are somewhat different than those of regular classroom teachers. The cooperating teachers were more worried and concerned about their teaching performance and being a good model. They appear to be more introspective and analytical than regular classroom teachers. They are more positive about learning new things from student teachers than those cooperating teachers who did not attend the workshop. They perceive the student teachers more positively than the non workshop group also.

Fourthly, the model was a way of organizing the supervisory process for cooperating teachers. Many of the participants as well as those who did not attend the workshop utilize components of the model. Both groups agreed that defining dimensions of teaching in observable terms, using observational instruments, and providing adequate feedback were important. They tended to disagree about zeroing in on one specific dimension and only observing dimensions which have been agreed upon beforehand. Workshop participants perceived a greater need for future training in supervision. What cannot be assessed is whether the workshop stimulated the need or whether they perceived this need beforehand and therefore participated in the workshop.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are some conclusions that can be made as a result of the study:

(1) The cooperating teachers and field supervisors perceive need for training in supervision.

(2) They feel that they should be more involved or at least informed about curricular and program decisions within the student teaching program and that the workshop should address some of these issues. They perceive the need for shared consensus of what to expect, the competencies students should have before and after student teaching, what and how to observe and how the student teachers should be evaluated.

(3) They agree that communication skills are important but only one skill. At times they perceive communication as not being as adequate as it should between the college and field supervisor.

(4) The model presented was one way of organizaing supervisory behavior. The participants tended to endorse some components and disagree with others. They would like to be involved in determining what model should be used with student teachers.

(5) The participants tend to be highly professional concerned with being a proper role model, anxious about their performance and introspective and analytical about their behavior. They are concerned about their effectiveness in helping the students they teach.

(6) The informal sharing among participants was probably as important as the formal aspects of the workshop. The teachers gained much through talking with other teachers about their programs and ways of doing things.

(7) The workshop did cause some teachers to look at their practices and utilize the concepts to improve their performance as a teacher and as a supervisor of student teachers.

There are a number of recommendations that can be made as a result of this study. These will be grouped under three areas: Model and Theory, Practice and Program, and Research and Evaluation.

Model and Theory:

(1) There should be a task force of cooperating teachers, student teachers, college teacher educators, school administrators, teaching association members formed to review and study existing models of supervision and review these as to how well they would work in the local context of the program and adapt or adopt one for use.

(2) A task force should define what competencies they expect of cooperating teachers and field supervisors.

(3) The task force should define what competencies they expect students to have prior to student teaching and after they complete the program.

Practice and Program:

(4) The College should investigate the needs of the supervising teachers and conduct an adequate needs assessment to gain information to plan future workshops.

(5) Workshops also should focus on the competencies expected of supervising teachers under any model developed for the program.

(6) Attention needs to be given to scheduling, physical facilities, as well as the type of activities, quality of speakers or trainers in planning prior to conducting the workshop.

(7) It may be possible to hold workshops in a school district where a large number of students are placed. Student teachers may be able to take over class for the day the workshop is held in order to keep the inservice costs at a minimum.

Research and Evaluation:

(8) There needs to be further research and follow-up of the impact of the workshop on the cooperating teachers during the next academic year.

(9) The perceptions and competencies of the student teachers as well as the cooperating teachers need to be assessed in future studies.

(10) If any future workshops are held or models developed, adequate research and design needs to be part of the program from the start.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bowman, N. College supervision of student teaching: A time to reconsider. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30, 29-30.

Boyan, N. J. Improving teacher preparation through training supervising teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, Illinois, April 1974) ED090 167.

Boyan, N. J. and Copeland, W. D. Instructional supervision training program. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1978.

Centra, J. A. Effectiveness of student feedback in modifying college instruction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1973, 65, 395-401.

Colbert, J. A. The development, implementation, and evaluation of an elementary student teacher supervision program utilizing an interaction analysis format. Unpublished Ed. D dissertation, University of Kansas, 1977.

Distinguished cooperating teacher program. Chicago, Chicago State University, 1973. ED 088 795.

Dyer, C. J. Humanistic competency training for supervisors and cooperating teachers. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education (BBB06621) ED 137 219.

Eberl, P. J. Growth in, with, and through an institute in supervision. Teacher Educator, 1977, 13, 27-29.

Gagne, R. The conditions of learning (3rd. ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1977.

Gladman, O. L. A proposed program for training of effective supervising teachers at Ottawa University. Final report. Washington, D. C.: National Center for Educational Research and Development, 1973, (BBB92778) ED 084 231.

George, A. and Borich G. D. and Fuller, F. F. Progress report on Research on "the Teachers Concern Checklist." Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas, February 28, 1974.

George, A. Measuring Self, Task and Impact Concerns: A manual for the use of the "Teacher Concerns Questionnaire." Austin, Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education: University of Texas (1978).

Heidelbach, R. (ed.) Developing supervisory practice. Bulletin No. 41. Washington, D. C.: Association of Teacher Educators, 1975.

Lang, D. C. et. al. A partnership for the supervision of student teachers. Mt. Pleasant, Michigan: Great Lakes Publishing Company, 1975.

Lipke, B. S. Give your student teachers a break. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30, 31-34.

Morris, J. P. The effects of the university supervisor on the performance and adjustment of student teachers. The Journal of Educational Research, 1974, 67, 358-362.

Parsons, J. S. Assessment of anxiety about teaching using the Teaching Anxiety Scale: Manual and Research Report. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (1973).

Peck, R. F. and Tucker, J. A. Research on teacher education. In Travers, R. M. (ed.). Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Professional teacher education module series. Supervise student teachers, Module 1-8 of category 1 -- Professional Role development. Athens, Georgia: American Association for Vocational Instructional Materials, Engineering Center, University of Georgia, 1978. ED 153 083.

Rotem, A. and Glasman, N. S. On the effectiveness of students' evaluative feedback to university instructors. Review of Educational Research, 1979, 49, 497-511.

Sunal, C. S. and Heidelbach, R. A. The impact of teacher education centers and other field-based models on student teaching, 1976. ED 137 281.

Tuckman, B. W. Evaluating instructional programs. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1979.

Appendix A

Letter of Invitation

Student Teacher Supervision Workshop

The College of Education of the University of Maine at Orono is sponsoring a one day Workshop on the supervision of student teachers. The Workshop objective will be to expose teachers in the field to systematic and objective methods of evaluating and supervising practice teachers. The Workshop will be held on Wednesday, April 9, 1980 from 8:00 to 4:15 p.m. in the Sutton Room of the Memorial Union Building.

The sessions will include large and small group instruction by trainers in communication skills, teaching/learning behaviors, and evaluation skills utilizing concepts and materials from the Instructional Supervision Training Program developed by Boyan and Copeland.

The project is being supported by a research grant from the Deans' Council of the New England Teacher Corps Network. The grant attempts to study the effects of specific training on cooperating teachers and students teachers.

Training manuals and materials will be provided the conference participants. The project is willing to reimburse the school district for the substitute teacher for the day of the workshop. The project will also pay a $10 stipend for gasoline and other expenses for the participants.

The Workshop will be restricted to twenty-five open registrations. If more than 25 individuals request registration, preference will be given to requests with the earliest postmark. Registrations will be confirmed.

APPENDIX B

LETTER OF CONFIRMATION OF REGISTRATION

March 28, 1980

Dear

This packet is to confirm your registration at the Student Teacher Supervision Workshop to be held at the University of Maine at Orono on April 9, 1980 from 8:00 a.m. to 4:15 p.m.

Enclosed please find a Request for Reimbursement form which you should forward to your Principal or Superintendent so that the school system will be reimbursed substitute wages to facilitate your absence. YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM MUST REQUEST THE REIMBURSEMENT. It will not be automatically forwarded until we receive the written request! Also enclosed you will find a Request for Personal Expenses form which you should bring to the conference and submit to the person at the registration table. This is so you can be reimbursed for your travel and other expenses.

As you can see from the workshop agenda we have an intensive day planned with little free time available. The workshop staff intends to follow the time allotments strictly and we are asking that all participants appear promptly during the 8:00 to 8:15 a.m. registration period. The registration will be handled at the door and you will receive a packet and other materials at that time.

We are looking forward to an informative and exciting workshop. There already exists a waiting list of some ten or twelve individuals. If by chance you cannot make it, please let us know as soon as possible by calling 581-2644 and asking for the Teacher Corps office. We are looking forward to working with you on the 9th.

Sincerely,

Gus LeBlanc
UMO/Teacher Corps
College of Education

GL/mp

Enclosure

APPENDIX C

REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT FORM

Student Teacher Supervision

- Workshop -

Request for Reimbursement

Date _____

Workshop Participant _____

School System _____

Address _____

_____

I hereby request reimbursement for one (1) substitute day in the amount of $ _____* for the above named teacher to attend the Student Teacher Supervision Workshop to be held at the University of Maine at Orono, April 9, 1980.

*maximum amount $25.00

_____
Authorizing Signature

_____
Position

APPENDIX D

REQUEST FOR PERSONAL REIMBURSEMENT FOR TRAVEL

Individual Reimbursement

- Request -

Student Teacher Supervision Workshop

April 9, 1980

University of Maine at Orono

Date _____

Name _____

School System _____

Address _____

_____

_____

I hereby request reimbursement for: *

mileage: $ _____

other (specify) $ _____

*maximum amount $10.00 (figure mileage at 13¢ per mile)

Signed _____

APPENDIX E

STUDENT TEACHER SUPERVISION

CONFERENCE AGENDA

STUDENT TEACHER SUPERVISION WORKSHOP

Wednesday, April 9, 1980
University of Maine at Orono

Location: Sutton Room, Memorial Union Building
Time: Registration 8:00 a.m. to 8:15 a.m.

Conference Agenda

8:00 - 8:15 a.m.	Registration. North Lown Room, Memorial Union. (Coffee and Donuts)
8:20 - 8:40 a.m.	Opening Remarks Dr. Ashley Gray, Director of Student Teaching College of Education University of Maine at Orono
8:45 - 9:15 a.m.	Overview of the Instructional Supervision Training Program Dr. David Bishop College of Education University of Maine at Orono
9:20 - 9:35 a.m.	Conference operation and logistics Gus LeBlanc UMO Teacher Corps Project
9:40 -10:20 a.m.	Large group session #1 Interpersonal Communication Skills (applications to the supervision of student teachers)
10:20-10:30 a.m.	Coffee break
10:30-10:50 a.m.	Small group sessions #1 Interpersonal Community Skills (activity)
10:55-11:45 a.m.	Large group session #2 Teaching/Learning Behaviors (behavioral language, behavioral and judgemental statements, and target and affecting behaviors)
11:50-12:20 a.m.	Small group session #2 Teaching/Learning Behaviors (activity)
12:20- 1:00 p.m.	Lunch (provided by the conference)

STUDENT TEACHER SUPERVISION CONFERENCE

Wednesday, April 9, 1980

Conference Agenda

1:05 - 1:25 p.m.	Feedback session (questions and answers over the morning sessions)
1:30 - 2:05 p.m.	Large group session #3 Systematic Observation Procedures (developing and utilizing observational instruments)
2:10 - 2:40 p.m.	Small group session #3 Systematic Observation (activity)
2:45 - 3:10 p.m.	Role Playing Session (conference participants as observers)
3:10 - 3:20 p.m.	Coke break
3:20 - 3:55 p.m.	Large group session #4 Determining Maintenance or Change in Teacher Behavior (analysis of observation, decision-making of affecting behavior)
4:00 - 4:15 p.m.	Closing Remarks

Conference Staff

Dr. Constance Perry	College of Education UMO	Trainer/Facilitator
Ms. Kay Paterson	Vermont Teacher Corps UVM	Trainer/Facilitator
Mr. Gus LeBlanc	Teacher Corps UMO	Trainer/Facilitator
Mr. Jerry Goss	Old Town Schools Old Town, Maine	Trainer/Facilitator
Dr. David Bishop	College of Education UMO	Trainer/Facilitator
Ms. Susan Merrifield	Teacher Corps UMO	Trainer/Facilitator

APPENDIX F

WAITING LIST LETTER

March 28, 1980

Dear Educator:

We are sorry, but all available space at the Student Teacher Supervision Workshop was filled prior to your registration material being received. We regret that we will not be able to extend a confirmed registration to you for the April 9th Workshop.

We have placed your name on a waiting list and will contact you prior to April 4, 1980 if a vacancy exists. Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

Gus LeBlanc
UMO/Teacher Corps
College of Education

GL/mp

APPENDIX G

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FORM

ID (Last 4 Digits of Social Security Number)

_____ (1-4)

Type of Position (5)

____ Teacher

____ Supervisor

____ Principal

____ Other

Number of years in teaching? _____ (6,7) In administration? _____ (8,9)

Number of student teachers supervised this year? _____ (10,11)

How many years have you supervised student teachers? _____ (12, 13)

Highest degree held? _____ (14)

Are you currently enrolled in a degree program? _____ (15)

If yes, type of program? _____ (16)

Have you had previous course work in supervision? _____ (17)

APPENDIX H

STUDENT TEACHER SUPERVISION WORKSHOP

EVALUATION FORM

STUDENT TEACHER SUPERVISION WORKSHOP

DIRECTIONS: Please read the following items and circle the appropriate number to the right of the item.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNSURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
1. The College of Education should continue to hold similar such workshops for cooperating teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The objectives that were set for the sessions were met by the trainers.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I would like to attend additional sessions on communication skills.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I felt that I gained information which will help me in supervising student teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The sessions did not meet my expectations of what should have been covered.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I would like to have more training in understanding teaching/learning behaviors.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I would be willing to participate in future workshops.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I gained a better understanding of observation skills than I had before the workshop.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Too many topics were covered in that session.	1	2	3	4	5
10. The activities in the workshop were appropriate for the topics presented.	1	2	3	4	5
11. The text and handouts were valuable and helpful.	1	2	3	4	5

Would you like further training in the supervision model presented today? YES NO

Would you be willing to attend other sessions on the model? YES NO

If yes, would you be willing to attend sessions:

After school	Yes	No
Evenings	Yes	No
Saturday	Yes	No
Other (please specify)_____		

If yes, would you be interested in credit for the sessions? Yes No

If yes, type of credit _____

Would you like to attend workshops for cooperating teachers and supervisors on other topics? Yes No

If yes, please list the topics _____

_____

What did you like the best about the workshop?

What did you like the least about the workshop?

APPENDIX I

POST QUESTIONNAIRE

Number of years taught? _____ (1, 2)

Number of student teachers supervised this year? _____ (3)

How many years have you supervised student teachers? _____ (4, 5)

Highest degree held? _____ (6)

Are you currently enrolled in a degree program? _____ (7)

If yes, type of program _____ (8)

Have you had a course in supervision? _____ (9)

Type of position _____ Teacher (elem.) _____ Teacher (sec.)
_____ Principal _____ Supervision _____ (10)

The following items relate to your feelings and behavior as a supervisor of student teachers. Please read each question carefully and answer every one even if it seems vague or difficult to answer. Circle only one number for each item.

	Never	Infrequently	Occasionally	Frequently	Always	
1. I feel calm and collected when I hold conferences with student teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	(11)
2. I feel that I would like to know more about how to supervise student teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	(12)
3. I am able to define dimensions of the teaching process in "observable" terms.	1	2	3	4	5	(13)
4. I zero in on just one specific dimension of teaching when I observe a student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	(14)
5. I am able to design observational instruments to help identify specific components of the teaching process for my student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	(15)
6. A supervisor should only observe the dimensions of teaching that the student teacher identifies as problem areas.	1	2	3	4	5	(16)

7.	Student teachers are able to identify their weak areas.	1	2	3	4	5	(17)
8.	Student teachers have a good background in the methodology of teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	(18)
9.	Student teachers have a good background in the content they teach.	1	2	3	4	5	(19)
10.	I am able to guide student teachers to identify their weak areas.	1	2	3	4	5	(20)
11.	I feel that I can provide an excellent model for my student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	(21)
12.	I feel nervous about having college supervisors observe me in my classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	(22)
13.	I learn new things and techniques from my student teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	(23)
14.	My student teachers are able to communicate their goals and objectives clearly to me.	1	2	3	4	5	(24)
15.	I use behavioral statements to describe the performance of the student teacher to him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	(25)
16.	I provide adequate feedback to my student teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	(26)
17.	At the end of student teaching, my student teacher can analyze and solve his/her own problems.	1	2	3	4	5	(27)
18.	I am able to help student teachers formulate alternative strategies in their problem areas.	1	2	3	4	5	(28)
19.	I'm less happy supervising student teachers than I thought I'd be.	1	2	3	4	5	(29)
20.	I get agreement from the student of what should be observed before observing the class.	1	2	3	4	5	(30)

Answer items 21 to 23 if you attended the April 9, 1980 workshop on supervision of student teachers at UMO.

21. Have you read the text by Boyan and Copeland? Yes No (31)

22. Have you used any of the concepts from the workshop or text in your work? Yes No (32)

_____

_____

_____

_____

23. Did the workshop provide any ideas or concepts which will help you improve as a teacher or supervisor? Yes No (33)

If yes, what ideas or concepts?

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX J

TEACHER CONCERNS CHECKLIST

Teaching Concerns

ID _____ (1-4)

DATE _____ (5)

The following checklist is designed to explore what school personnel are concerned about. There are, of course, no right or wrong answers; each person has his or her own concerns.

For the purposes of this checklist, please consider yourself concerned about something if you think about it often and would like to do something about it.

Please read each item carefully and respond by circling the appropriate number to the left of the item. Please respond to every item.

When you think about your teaching, to what extent are you concerned about each of the following:

		Not concerned at all	Slightly Concerned	Moderately Concerned	Very Concerned	Extremely Concerned	
1.	Lack of respect of some students.	1	2	3	4	5	(6)
2.	Standards and regulations set for teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	(7)
3.	Selecting and teaching content well.	1	2	3	4	5	(8)
4.	The mandated curriculum is not appropriate for all students.	1	2	3	4	5	(9)
5.	Whether students are learning what they should.	1	2	3	4	5	(10)
6.	Whether the students really like me or not.	1	2	3	4	5	(11)
7.	Increasing students' feelings of accomplishment.	1	2	3	4	5	(12)
8.	The nature and quality of instructional materials.	1	2	3	4	5	(13)
9.	Where I stand as a teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	(14)
10.	Motivating students to study.	1	2	3	4	5	(15)
11.	Working productively with other teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	(16)
12.	Lack of instructional materials.	1	2	3	4	5	(17)
13.	Rapid rate of curriculum and instructional change.	1	2	3	4	5	(18)

14.	Feeling under pressure too much of the time.	1	2	3	4	5	(19)
15.	The routine and inflexibility of the situation.	1	2	3	4	5	(20)
16.	Becoming too personally involved with students.	1	2	3	4	5	(21)
17.	Maintaining the appropriate degree of class control.	1	2	3	4	5	(22)
18.	Acceptance as a friend by students.	1	2	3	4	5	(23)
19.	Understanding the principal's policies.	1	2	3	4	5	(24)
20.	The wide range of student achievement.	1	2	3	4	5	(25)

When you think about your teaching, to what extent are you concerned about each of the following:

(You are concerned about something if you think about it often and would like to do something about it.)

21.	Doing well when a supervisor is present.	1	2	3	4	5	(26)
22.	Meeting the needs of different kinds of students.	1	2	3	4	5	(27)
23.	Being fair and impartial.	1	2	3	4	5	(28)
24.	Diagnosing student learning problems.	1	2	3	4	5	(29)
25.	Getting a favorable evaluation of my teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	(30)
26.	Being asked personal questions by my students.	1	2	3	4	5	(31)
27.	Too many noninstructional duties.	1	2	3	4	5	(32)
28.	Insuring that students grasp subject matter fundamentals.	1	2	3	4	5	(33)
29.	Working with too many students each day.	1	2	3	4	5	(34)
30.	Challenging unmotivated students.	1	2	3	4	5	(35)

31.	The values and attitudes of the current generation.	1	2	3	4	5	(36)
32.	Adapting myself to the needs of different students.	1	2	3	4	5	(37)
33.	Whether students can apply what they learn.	1	2	3	4	5	(38)
34.	Understanding the philosophy of the school.	1	2	3	4	5	(39)
35.	Students who disrupt classes.	1	2	3	4	5	(40)
36.	Instilling worthwhile concepts and values.	1	2	3	4	5	(41)
37.	How students feel about me.	1	2	3	4	5	(42)
38.	Student health and nutrition problems that affect learning.	1	2	3	4	5	(43)
39.	The psychological climate of the school.	1	2	3	4	5	(44)
40.	Clarifying the limits of my authority and responsibility.	1	2	3	4	5	(45)
41.	Assessing and reporting student progress.	1	2	3	4	5	(46)
42.	Chronic absence and dropping out of students.	1	2	3	4	5	(47)
43.	Lack of academic freedom.	1	2	3	4	5	(48)
44.	Teaching required content to students of varied background.	1	2	3	4	5	(49)

When you think about your teaching, to what extent are you concerned about each of the following:

(You are concerned about something if you think about it often and would like to do something about it)

45.	Student use of drugs.	1	2	3	4	5	(50)
46.	Feelings more adequate as a teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	(51)
47.	Guiding students toward intellectual and emotional growth.	1	2	3	4	5	(52)
48.	Being accepted and respected by professional persons.	1	2	3	4	5	(53)
49.	Adequately presenting all of the required material.	1	2	3	4	5	(54)
50.	Slow progress of certain students.	1	2	3	4	5	(55)
51.	My ability to present ideas to the class.	1	2	3	4	5	(56)
52.	Helping students to value learning.	1	2	3	4	5	(57)
53.	Whether each student is getting what he needs.	1	2	3	4	5	(58)
54.	Increasing my proficiency in content.	1	2	3	4	5	(59)
55.	Recognizing the social and emotional needs of students.	1	2	3	4	5	(60)
56.	The wide diversity of student ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds.	1	2	3	4	5	(61)
57.	Training of future teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	(62)
58.	Knowing effective ways of communicating to student teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	(63)
59.	Knowing how to identify problem areas in my teaching and/or my student teacher's teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	(64)
60.	Knowing how to analyze my teaching and/or student teacher's teaching through use of observational scales.	1	2	3	4	5	(65)

APPENDIX K

TEACHER ANXIETY SCALE

DATE _____ ID _____

Directions: The following items relate to your feelings about yourself as a teacher and supervisor. Please read each question carefully and answer every one, even if it seems vague or difficult to answer. Circle only one number for each item.

	Never	Infrequently	Occasionally	Frequently	Always	
I feel calm and collected when I think about holding parent-teacher conferences.	1	2	3	4	5	(6)
I'm worried whether I can be a good teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	(7)
I would feel calm and collected if a student's parent observed in my classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	(8)
I feel secure with regard to my ability to keep a class under control.	1	2	3	4	5	(9)
I'm less happy teaching than I thought I'd be.	1	2	3	4	5	(10)
I feel confident about my ability to improvise in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	(11)
I feel other teachers think I'm very competent.	1	2	3	4	5	(12)
I worry about being able to keep the students interested in what I teach them.	1	2	3	4	5	(13)
Deciding how to present information in the classroom makes me feel uncertain.	1	2	3	4	5	(14)
I feel I have good recall of the things I know when I am in front of the class.	1	2	3	4	5	(15)
I'm worried whether I can be a good cooperating supervising teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	(16)
I feel that I provide an excellent model for my student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	(17)
I can communicate clearly the weak areas which my student teacher has.	1	2	3	4	5	(18)
I feel nervous about having college supervisors and students observe me in my classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	(19)
I feel I do not know enough about supervision to help properly my student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	(20)